

Remarks

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-22, and 40 are presented for reconsideration. Claims 7-9 and 13-15 are, at present, withdrawn from consideration. In the event that the respective independent claims from which they depend either directly or indirectly are allowed, it is respectfully requested that they also be allowed. Claims 1, 16, and 40 are sought to be amended to further clarify Applicant's techniques. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-22, and 40 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 16, and 40 being the independent claims.

These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 40 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons stated below and respectfully requests this rejection be removed and this claim be passed to allowance.

Claim 40 as pending is directed towards a computer readable medium, ***not a signal***, and represents statutory subject matter. On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 40 on the grounds that the Applicant's specification includes intangible media such as carrier waves as an example of computer readable medium.

Applicant submits that paragraph [0065] of the specification also includes examples of tangible computer readable storage media such as read-only memory, random-access memory, CD-ROMs, DVDs, magnetic tape, and optical data storage devices.

However, to expedite prosecution, claim 40 has been amended to recite a computer readable storage medium comprising computer program code that enables a processor to restrict use of a clipboard application. Support for the amendment to claim 40 is found at least in paragraph [0065] of the instant specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 16, 20-22, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Adobe Acrobat 5.0 as evidenced by Non-Patent Literature “Adobe Acrobat 5.0 Classroom in a Book” (“Adobe”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and respectfully requests this rejection be removed and these claims be passed to allowance.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires showing the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. See *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Claims 1, 16, and 40

Claims 1, 16, and 40 as amended herein recite features that distinguish over the applied reference. For example, claims 1, 16, and 40 recite a method, a computer-implemented method, and computer readable storage medium comprising program code,

respectively, for restricting use of a clipboard application by receiving a copy selection, in a *multi-application* computing environment, a copy selection associated with designated *content* of a source file being displayed by an application, determining whether the source file is a secured file that cannot be accessed without *a priori* knowledge, and preventing subsequent usage of the *content* in a destination application via the clipboard application when the determining determines that the source file is a secured file.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the examiner states that pages 2 and 3 of Adobe disclose the above recited features of claims 1, 16, and 40. Applicant has examined pages 2 and 3 of Adobe and submits that Adobe is limited to preventing opening and modification of Portable Document Format (PDF) files in a single-application Adobe Acrobat environment (Adobe, pages 1-3). Applicant further submits that opening a PDF file with the Adobe Acrobat document exchange tool (Adobe, page 1) is not analogous to receiving a copy selection in a *multi-application* environment, wherein the copy selection is associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by a source application, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. Although Adobe may disclose password protection of proprietary format PDF files (Adobe, page 2), Adobe does not teach or suggest restricting use of a clipboard application by receiving, in a *multi-application* computing environment, a copy selection associated with designated content of a source file being displayed by an application, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. The Examiner appears to interpret Adobe's Acrobat PDF "file security" features (Adobe, pages 1 and 2) as reading on the recited methods of claims 1 and 16 and computer readable medium of claim 40. Even assuming for the sake of argument that the

Examiner's interpretation is correct, (which Applicant disagrees with), Applicant submits that while Adobe may teach restricting opening and modifying of PDF files using the proprietary Adobe Acrobat product, Adobe does not teach or suggest restricting use of a clipboard application in a multi-application computing environment when it has been determined that a source file is a secured file as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40.

Adobe does not teach or suggest preventing subsequent use of a source file after determining that the source file is a secured file as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40.

Although Adobe may disclose that the Acrobat product can protect "sensitive PDF files from unauthorized changes" (Adobe, page 4), Adobe does not teach or suggest preventing *subsequent* use of the content in a destination application via a clipboard application when it has been determined that a source file is a secured file, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. While Adobe may disclose limiting PDF file access and modification in the *Adobe Acrobat* application based on passwords (Adobe, page 2), Adobe lacks any teaching or suggestion of preventing subsequent use of a secured file in a multi-application computing environment after determining that the file is a secured file, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. Although Adobe may disclose preventing using the Acrobat application to modify PDF files based on passwords (Adobe, page 2), Adobe does not teach or suggest preventing subsequent usage of clipboard content in a *multi-application environment* in a destination application via the clipboard application when it has been determined that the source file is a secured file as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40.

Applicant submits that Adobe's application to limit opening and copying of Acrobat PDF files is not analogous to the method, computer-implemented method, and

computer readable medium recited in claims 1, 16, and 40, respectively, that prevent subsequent usage and storage of *contents secured files*. As recited in claims 1, 16, and 40, and as disclosed in paragraph 17 of Applicant's specification, secured files include documents such as executable code, data, and text that that cannot be accessed without *a priori* knowledge. As is known in the art and disclosed in Adobe, PDF files are a specific, proprietary file format created with Adobe's Acrobat software (Adobe, pages 1-4). Applicant submits that PDF files are not analogous to the secured file recited in claims 1, 16, and 40. PDF files correspond to a single, limited, and proprietary file format created with the Adobe Acrobat product and read with the Adobe Acrobat reader software application. Adobe Acrobat cannot not display or modify secured source file contents such as executable code and data unless they have been previously converted to the PDF format. PDF files are rendered and displayed by the Acrobat application and are not analogous to secured source files recited in claims 1, 16, and 40 as alleged by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action. Even assuming for the sake of argument that the Examiner's interpretation is correct (which Applicant disagrees with), Applicant submits that a source file which has been converted *into* a an Adobe PDF file is not analogous to a secured source file which cannot be accessed without *a priori* knowledge such as a file encryption key, as recited in claims 1, 16, and 40.

At least based on their respective dependencies to claim 1, claims 2-6 and 10-12 should be found allowable, as well as for their additional respective distinguishing features. Dependent claims 2-6 and 10-12, which depend upon independent claim 1, are allowable for at least being dependent from allowable independent claim 1, in addition to their own respective distinguishing features. See *In Re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir.

1988) and M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-6 and 10-12 be removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Also, at least based on their respective dependencies to claim 16, claims 17-22 should be found allowable, as well as for their additional respective distinguishing features.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of these claims, and find them allowable over the applied reference.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-12 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious in view of Adobe and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0037253 to Blank *et al* ("Blank").

As discussed above, independent claim 1 as amended herein is distinguishable over the applied reference. Dependent claims 10-12, which depend upon independent claim 1, are allowable for at least being dependent from an allowable independent claim, in addition to their own distinguishing features.

Further, as discussed above, independent claim 16 as amended herein is distinguishable over the applied reference. Dependent claims 17-19, which depend upon independent claim 16, are allowable for at least being dependent from an allowable independent claim, in addition to their own distinguishing features.

Moreover, claims 17 and 18 recite features that distinguish over the applied references. For example, claim 17 recites the method for restricting use of a clipboard application in a multi-application computing environment of claim 16 wherein the method further comprises storing alternate content to the clipboard application in place of the designated content when the determining determines that the source file is a *secured file*. Claim 18 recites the method from claim 17 wherein the alternate content is one or more of blank content, predetermined content, and scrambled content.

Applicant submits that neither Adobe, nor Blank, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the recited elements of claims 17 and 18. Claims 17 and 18 recite an additional distinguishing feature, storing alternate content to a clipboard application in place of designated content when it has been determined that a source file is a *secured file*, not taught by Adobe or Blank either alone or in the alleged obvious combination.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Adobe does not disclose storing alternate content to a clipboard application in place of designated content when it has been determined that a source file is a secured file.

Blank does not cure these deficiencies of Adobe with respect to claims 17 and 18. On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Blank discloses the above recited features of claims 17 and 18 in paragraph [0046]. Applicant has examined paragraph [0046] of Blank and submits that while Blank may disclose an applet that disables copying and printing of *web page content* in Internet browsers such as Microsoft Explorer and Netscape Navigator (Blank, paragraphs [0032] and [0046]), Blank does not teach or suggest storing alternate content to a clipboard application in place of *secured files*, as recited in claims 17 and 18.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of these claims, and find them allowable over the applied references.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Glenn J. Perry
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 28,458

Date: November 1, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
734899v2